IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

MICHAEL R. BOEHM,

Plaintiff,

OPINION AND ORDER

ν.

14-cv-178-wmc

SANDRA La Du-IVES, et al.,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Michael Boehm filed this proposed civil action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, concerning the conditions of his confinement at the Marathon County Jail. He was found eligible to proceed without prepayment of the full filing fee for purposes of the Prison Litigation Reform Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b). To date, however, he has not made an initial partial payment of the filing fee in compliance with the PLRA. The court's order directing him to do so has been returned "undeliverable" and unable to forward because plaintiff has not provided a valid address. (Dkt. # 5).

It is not the obligation of either this court or the clerk's office to search for litigants. Rather, it is the litigant's responsibility to advise the court of any change to his or her contact information. *See Casimir v. Sunrise Fin., Inc.*, 299 F. App'x 591, 593, 2008 WL 4922422 (7th Cir. 2008) (affirming the denial of a Rule 60(b) motion where movants claimed they did not receive notice of summary judgment due to a house fire, adding that "all litigants, including pro se litigants, are responsible for maintaining

2005) ("[A] litigant who invokes the processes of the federal courts is responsible for maintaining communication with the court during the pendency of his lawsuit."). The

communication with the court"); see also Soliman v. Johanns, 412 F.3d 920, 922 (8th Cir.

plaintiff has evidently failed to provide the court with an accurate, current address.

Because plaintiff has failed to provide a current address, it appears that he has abandoned

his complaint.

Accordingly, under the inherent power necessarily vested in a court to manage its own docket, the complaint will be dismissed without prejudice for want of prosecution. See FED. R. CIV. P. 41(b); Link v. Wabash R.R. Co., 370 U.S. 626, 630-31 (1962); Ohio

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the complaint filed by plaintiff Michael R. Boehm is DISMISSED without prejudice for want of prosecution. Plaintiff is advised that relief from this order may be granted upon a showing of good cause.

Entered this 29th day of April, 2014.

River Co. v. Carrillo, 754 F.2d 236, 238 n.5 (7th Cir. 1984).

BY THE COURT:

/s/

WILLIAM M. CONLEY District Judge

2